

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSICNER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

			www.mapungov	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/838,161	04/20/2001	Fumiaki Aga	401171	9027
23548 75	90 06/07/2002			
LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD			EXAMINER	
700 THIRTEEN SUITE 300	NTH ST. NW		CRUZ, LOURDES C	
WASHINGTON	N, DC 20005-3960		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2827	

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	/100					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/838,161	AGA, FUMIAKI				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Lourdes C. Cruz	2827				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 GFR 1.13 after 3X(c) MOVINTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for crept, specified above is less than thinly (30) days, a reply of the communication of th	16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day	nely filed s will be considered timely.				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 A	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 April 2002</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Thi	s action is non-final.					
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. isposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) 7 is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are rejected to.						
_						
8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>7</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.						
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
riority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).						
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 						
15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic						
ttachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.		(PTO-413) Paper No(s) eatent Application (PTO-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election without traverse of Claims 1-6 in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1,3,4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 3 and 5 recite "a color difference" between "a color" and "a color of a standard substance" having a value of at least 30. Not only has "a color" been introduced in the claims more than once, making it very confusing and improperly drafted, but also the claims are indefinite and confusing to the examiner. Additionally, it is unclear what "a value of at least" 30/10 refers to. Since the claims have been rendered indefinite, examination has been completed only as best understood by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States. Application/Control Number: 09/838,161 Art Unit: 2827

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Asada (JP 10204155 A).

Regarding claims 1,2,3,5 and 6. Asada discloses:

An epoxy resin (See abstract) sealing a chip including a filler containing 15 wt.% with respect to total filler and having particles of no more than 10µm in size; and a laser mark (YAG laser) on the package.

Regarding the limitations reciting the difference in color and its value, see that the device disclosed by the prior art meets the structural characteristics recited in the claims. It is inherent from this that it will display the same "colorimeter value" claimed.

Regarding claim 4, the claim recites poduct by process limitations. A "product by process" claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685; In re Luck, 177 USPQ 523; In re Fessmann, 180 USPQ 324; In re Avery, 186 USPQ 161; In re Wertheim, 191 USPQ 90 (209 USPQ 554 does not deal with this issue); In re Marosi et al, 218 USPQ 289; and particularly In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964, all of which make it clear that it is the patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a "product by process" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not. Note that applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above case law makes clear.

Application/Control Number: 09/838,161 Art Unit: 2827 Page 4

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lourdes C. Cruz whose telephone number is 703-306-5691. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:00-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Talbott can be reached on 703-305-9883. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956

Lourdes C. Cruz Examiner Art Unit 2827

Lourdes Cruz May 26, 2002

HE THE RESIDENCE OF THE PARTY OF THE PERSON OF THE PERSON

DAVID L. TALBOTT SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800